

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PROJECT SENTINEL,)

Plaintiff(s),)

v.)

RUTH BRIONES, et al.,)

Defendant(s).)

VICTOR NEWMAN,)

Plaintiff(s),)

v.)

RUTH BRIONES, et al.,)

Defendant(s).)

No. C04-3792 MJJ (BZ)

Consolidated with:

No. C04-3793 MJJ (BZ)

**ORDER COMPELLING FURTHER
DISCOVERY**

Having reviewed the papers filed by both sides, **IT IS
HEREBY ORDERED** as follows:

1. Plaintiff's motion to compel further answer to Interrogatory No. 7 as to defendants Glass Trust (Glass), Baum Trust (Baum), and J. Sosnick & Sons (Sosnick) is **GRANTED** to extent it seeks information about any other property

1 managed by Ruth Briones and **DENIED** in all other respects.
2 Plaintiff has not established that information about any
3 property other than one managed by Briones is relevant to any
4 claim or defense in this action.

5 2. Plaintiff's motion to compel further answer to
6 Interrogatory No.8 as to Glass, Baum and Sosnick is **GRANTED**
7 to the extent that each defendant must state its present net
8 worth and **DENIED** without prejudice in all other respects.
9 This information shall be disclosed to plaintiff's counsel
10 only pursuant to an appropriate protective order. If after
11 receiving the answer, plaintiff's counsel doubt the accuracy
12 of the information, or believe they need further information,
13 they may renew their request for further detail by sending a
14 letter to the court pursuant to my initial discovery order
15 expressing their doubts.

16 3. Plaintiff's motion to compel further answer to
17 Interrogatory No. 8 as to defendant Briones is **GRANTED** to the
18 extent she is required to identify any other rental property
19 she has owned in part or in full since January 1, 2000 and
20 **DENIED** in all other respects.

21 4. Plaintiff's motion to compel further answer to
22 Interrogatory No. 9 as to Briones is **GRANTED** to the extent
23 that she shall provide her net worth to plaintiff's counsel
24 pursuant to a protective order and **DENIED** without prejudice
25 in all other respects for the reasons given in paragraph 2.

26 5. Plaintiff's motion to compel Glass, Baum and Sosnick
27 to produce documents in response to Requests No. 21, 22, and
28 23 is **DENIED** without prejudice to being renewed if plaintiff

1 is not satisfied with the net worth information it receives.

2 6. Plaintiff's motion to compel Briones to produce
3 further documents in response to Requests 19, 20, 21, 22 and
4 23 is **DENIED** without prejudice to being renewed if plaintiff
5 is not satisfied with the net worth information it receives.

6 Further answers are due from the individual defendants
7 by **August 1, 2005** and from Sosnick by **September 1, 2005**.

8 Dated: July 6, 2005

9
10 

11 Bernard Zimmerman
12 United States Magistrate Judge

13 G:\BZALL\REFS\PROJECT SENTINEL\DISCOVERY3.ORDER.wpd
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28